

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

"THE U-2 MUST FLY AGAIN"

Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the current U.S. News & World Report carries as its lead article "an interview that represents the viewpoint of important groups of officials in the military services of this country and in the U.S. Department of State." The headline is "The U-2 Must Fly Again."

The list of the article is contained in the following questions and answers:

Question. Is there in the Government any pressure to resume U-2 flights or other means of aerial reconnaissance?

Answer. Yes, there is. The technical experts and political experts at the working level, as well as military officials, feel that unless we are able to resume reconnaissance flights, the Soviets will have gained a major military advantage.

The Soviet Union has an important and growing stockpile of intercontinental missiles. Until now, we have been able to locate and follow the placement of those missiles. We now are giving up the means of continuing to pinpoint missile bases from which an attack on United States can be launched.

Question. Is that important?

Answer. Indeed it is. During the next months to a year, the Soviet Union will be building new bases, relocating its missile sites, camouflaging those sites. During that period, under present rules of the game, the United States will have no means by which it can know the location of missile sites. Its military services will be blinded, unaware of the vital targets if war should come.

Now that Soviet Russia knows that the United States has given up reconnaissance, its opportunities for blackmail will be increased immensely.

Question. And this country will be in ignorance of what is going on?

Answer. In almost complete ignorance. Then, when the job of missile emplacement is completed, Khrushchev will be in a position to say, "Now we will bargain on Berlin. These are our terms and they are our minimum terms. Take them."

When a showdown comes over Berlin, someday it will, an American President will face the risk of war. The military uncertainty of location of Soviet missiles, will be unable to give the President assurance that it can destroy those bases. Military commanders could not promise—even by striking first—to assure a President that the cities of America would not be destroyed.

Any President, no matter who he is, would try to gain time. He would be under the greatest pressure to agree to concessions. The process of disintegration would begin.

Question. How widespread are the views you are expressing?

Answer. Among the working groups, the views are very widespread. They are held widely by the military.

Question. So what do we do? What should this country do?

Answer. It is important that reconnaissance over Soviet Russia be resumed and that it be conducted continuously so that the pictures of one week can be matched against the pictures of another week, to keep track of the changes. We have the pattern of Soviet missile armament. You have given the Soviet Union a chance to camouflage their missile program for relocating bases.

The U-2, or a successor, must fly again as one elemental safeguard against surprise attack. This country simply cannot be left in the dark without increasing greatly both the danger of blackmail and the danger of war.

important as pictured?

Answer. There has been official discussion on that point. The answer is "Yes," to the question, "Should the Soviet point be taken?"

Magist U-2 flies flying, the Russian point could be sure of the amount of Soviet military activity and of their war preparations. This increased the Soviet risk. Now that it has been removed.

Question. But, as country would be the United States are their base from which to resume reconnaissance flights.

Answer. There should be aircraft carrier. It is doubtful if the Soviet Union would attack a U.S. aircraft carrier, unless it was ready for a one-way.

Question. And you say that we should start again?

Answer. We should resume reconnaissance flights.

Of course, groups of State Department and military men have the right to question the wisdom of the President's announcement last month that U-2 flights are discontinued. What bothers me is that the article offers no evidence that these "important groups of officials" have taken into their calculations certain facts and propositions.

One of these is that the President has given his solemn assurance that the U-2 flights are being discontinued.

The main point of the important groups is that without the U-2, we have no means of identifying additional Soviet Union missile launching sites as they are constructed. Let us assume for the purposes of argument that this is true. We still would have the capability, in the event of a Soviet attack, of destroying much of her cities, her airfields, her military installations. If we are going to strike first, in a preemptive war, it is indeed desirable that we know the location of every last Soviet missile base, so that we can put them all out of action at one fell swoop—although I do not quite see how the U-2 will tell the preemptive warriors when to let fly. If we are not going to strike first, I question whether the fact that we can add to our retaliatory blow at Russia's cities and industries a strike at a larger number of missile bases constitutes much of an additional deterrent.

Therefore, if our reliance against a Soviet attack lies in our power to retaliate, rather than in our power to start a preemptive war, resuming U-2 flights provides only a marginal increment to our strength.

The great danger in the position of the "important groups" lies in the fact that the information produced by additional U-2 flights is vastly more important and valuable to a country going on a preemptive war than to a country relying on retaliation. If we assume that the U-2 will know the location of every last Soviet missile base, we can have a preemptive war. If the Kremlin wanted to strike first, it is this, if you will, right in the hands of the "important groups" in this week's U.S. News & World Report. A copy of which can be held or with a U-2, and we are apparently going to start a preemptive war, why don't we let the Kremlin to prevent the preemptive war that they are about to start?

...possibility in... events... control...

...the U.S. News & World Report... the "important groups"...

FOIAb3b